

2026 (G26) Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program BLM - Palm Springs South Coast Field Office's Factual Findings

The information provided below is the OHMVR Division's Factual Findings for this Applicant. The information provided reflects the OHMVR Division's review and determination of the Applicant's final Application.

General Evaluation Criteria:

- #1d – OHV Opportunity Ratio. Add 5 points.
- #6 – Applicant has been responsive. Add 3 points.
- #7a – Narrative does not support the selection. Deduct 10 points.
- #9a – Narrative does not support the selection. Applicant references 2008 Soil Standards. Deduct 5 points.

Restoration: G26-01-13-R01

Project Description – Background

- No change.

Project Description – Project Description

- A reminder for all Restoration Projects: Any activities or costs associated with identifying, evaluating, or initiating restoration at new sites are not eligible in this Grant cycle. Under CCR §4970.11(f)(1), Restoration Projects must include defined Deliverables tied to a known site, and CCR §4970.09(b)(5) prohibits funding for future or undefined work. Applicants must apply under the Restoration Planning category to develop new sites or return in the next Grant cycle with a fully defined restoration scope and remove all related language and costs.

Project Description – List of Project Deliverables

- #4 – Based on the Applicant's written response and the observations from the recent site visit, the proposal does not demonstrate a justified need to replace the existing fence. The current fencing remains functional, and the applicant did not provide adequate evidence of OHV-related repair needs. Replacement of the old fence is not eligible for funding and must be removed from the application, including all related language and costs.
- #5 – Applicant did not clarify how these activities align with the corresponding Project Deliverable and their associated costs. If awarded, Applicant must remove the deliverable.

Project Description – All Others

- No change.

Project Cost Estimate

- Staff #1 "Operations - Core Team" – Applicant did not clarify what "includes maintenance & repairs of facilities, installation of route & trail signage that provide OHV Opportunities" means, as these are considered Ground Operations activities. Removing these two (2) of the three (3) defined activities reduces the line item by 66.67%. Deduct \$57,603 from Grant. Revised total for this line item is now Grant \$28,797 and match \$0. Additionally, Applicant did not provide enough detail explaining why the existing fencing is inadequate. Project maps show that about three-quarters of the 8,000 feet of fencing is simply replacing existing T posts and barbed wire. Therefore, only 2,000 feet of new pipe and cable fencing is needed, and the associated cost is reduced by 75%. Deduct \$21,598 from the Grant. The revised totals for this line item are now \$7,199 Grant.
- Staff # 2 "Civil Engineer" – Applicant did not provide sufficient additional details explaining why the existing fencing is inadequate and needs to be replaced. Reduce costs associated with fencing by 75%. Deduct a total of \$11,550 from the Grant and \$4,950 from the match. The revised total for this line item is now Grant \$3,850 and match \$1,650. Additionally, Applicant did not provide sufficient clarification on how Project Deliverable #5 aligns with the Project, as it appears to be a Ground Operations activity. Applicant identifies four (4) Project Deliverables associated with the line item. Removing one (1) of these Project Deliverables reduces this line item by 25%. Deduct a total of \$963 from the Grant and \$413 from the match. Revised total for this line item is now Grant \$2,887 and match \$1,237.
- Staff #3 "Archaeologist" – Applicant did not provide enough detail to justify replacing the existing fencing. Reduce expenses by 75%. Deduct a total of \$3,004 from the Grant and \$371 from the match. The revised total for this line item is now Grant \$1,001 and match \$124.
- Staff #5 "Natural Resource Specialist" – Applicant did not provide enough detail to justify replacing the existing fencing. Reduce expenses by 75%. Deduct a total of \$2,683 from the Grant and \$332 from the match. The revised total for this line item is now Grant \$895 and match \$111.
- Materials / Supplies #1 "Fence" – Applicant did not provide enough detail to justify replacing the existing fencing. Reduce fencing costs by 75%. Deduct \$120,000 from the Grant. The revised total for this line item is now Grant \$40,000.
- Materials / Supplies #2 "Field Supplies" – Applicant did not provide enough detail to justify replacing the existing fencing. Reduce costs by 75%. Deduct \$1,500 from the Grant. The revised total for this line item is now Grant \$500.
- Equipment Use Expenses #1 "BLM 1 and 1/2 T Service Utility 4X4" – Applicant did not provide enough detail to justify replacing the existing fencing. Reduce expenses by 75%. Deduct \$702 from the match. The revised total for this line item is now match \$234.
- Equipment Use Expenses #2 "BLM 3/4T Crew Cab Service Utility 4X4" – Applicant did not provide enough detail to justify replacing the existing fencing. Reduce expenses by 75%. Deduct \$425 from the match. The revised total for this line item is now match \$142.
- Equipment Use Expenses #3 "BLM 3/4T Crew Cab Service Utility 4X4" – Applicant did not provide enough detail to justify replacing the existing fencing. Reduce expenses by 75%. Deduct \$138 from the match. The revised total for this line item is now match \$46.
- Equipment Use Expenses #4 "BLM 3/4T 4X4 Crew Cab (Service)" – Applicant did

not provide enough detail to justify replacing the existing fencing. Reduce expenses by 75%. Deduct \$138 from the match. The revised total for this line item is now \$46 match.

- Equipment Use Expenses #5 & 6 – Applicant did not provide additional information on how the Equipment is used in the Project. Applicant shall remove the line item entirely.
- Equipment Use Expenses #7 “BLM 3/4T Crew Cab Service Utility 4X4” – Applicant did not provide enough detail to justify replacing the existing fencing. Reduce expenses by 75%. Deduct \$425 from the match. The revised total for this line item is now match \$142.
- Equipment Use Expenses #8 “Skidsteer Rental (2)” – Applicant did not provide enough detail to justify replacing the existing fencing. Reduce the expenses by one skid steer. Deduct \$2,237 from the Grant. The revised total for this line item is now Grant \$2,237.
- Others #1 “Program Related Travel (construction)” – Applicant did not provide enough detail to justify replacing the existing fencing. Reduce expenses by 75%. Deduct \$25,200 from the Grant. The revised total for this line item is now Grant \$8,400.
- Indirect Costs #1 “Admin - Project Implementation” – Applicant did not provide enough detail to justify replacing the existing fencing. Reduce expenses by 75%. Deduct \$24,000 from the match. The revised total for this line item is now match \$8,000.
- Indirect Costs #2 “Utility Costs” – Applicant did not provide enough detail to justify replacing the existing fencing. Reduce expenses by 75%. Deduct of \$4,500 from the match. The revised total for this line item is now match \$1,500.
- Indirect Costs #3 “Management Team” – Applicant did not provide enough detail to justify replacing the existing fencing. Reduce expenses by 75%. Deduct \$6,000 from the match. The revised total for this line item is \$2,000 match. In addition, Staff positions listed in this Application shall be filled before the final Application submission. Therefore, “conducts hiring of seasonal employees (paperwork and interviews)” is not eligible. Applicant identifies four (4) Project Deliverables associated with the line item. Removing one (1) of these Project Deliverables reduces this line item by 25%. Deduct \$500 from the match. The revised total for this line item is \$1,500 match.
- Indirect Cost – Applicant has now exceeded the 15% allowable. Deduct \$1,180 from the match on any Indirect line item.

Revised Totals

Grant Request: \$65,469

Match: \$22,101

Total Project Cost: \$87,570

Evaluation Criteria

- #2 – Narrative does not support the selection "Archeological and historical resources". Applicant did not identify at least one archeological and/or historical resource identified within either the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places. Deduct 3 points.
- #4 – The Project Description does not support the selection of “Use of native plants

and materials.” In addition, the applicant did not provide sufficient information to demonstrate that the “Incorporation of universally recognized Best Management Practices” would be implemented effectively or contribute to successful project outcomes. Deduct 4 points.

- #8 – Narrative does not support the selection. It is unclear how each partner actively participates in the Project. Deduct 4 points.
- #11 – Project Description section does not support "1-10 acres within the Project Area..." of sensitive habitats which will be actively restored within the Project area. Applicant did not provide Active Restoration Activities. Deduct 3 points.

Law Enforcement: G26-01-13-L01

Need Assessment

- No change.

Needs Enforcement Certification

- No change.

Project Cost Estimate

- No change.